

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed June 2, 2009 the Office noted that claims 1-20 were pending and rejected claims 1-20. Claims 1-20 have been amended, claim 4 has been cancelled, and, thus, in view of the foregoing claims 1-3 and 5-20 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Office's rejections are traversed below.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-5, 9-13, 15-17 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Maillard, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0129249 in view of Menezes, *Handbook on Applied Cryptography*. The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an argument.

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Office acknowledges that Maillard does not disclose "a step for constructing a single identifier for a group of several computer software programs to be transmitted during step c) based on information relating to each of the software programs of the group and in that the at least one encryption/decryption module carries out the same operation as that carried out during step e) in order to reconstruct a unique identifier corresponding to that constructed during step e) if the group received by the decoder is identical to that transmitted by the transmitter," but asserts that "Menezes, page 346, section 9.6.3 teaches data integrity using a

MAC. The sender computes the MAC and transmits it to the receiver. The receiver then uses the MAC to make sure that the data has not been altered in transit."

However, Menezes discusses data integrity using a MAC (Message Authentication Code). The process comprises the following steps:

- calculation of a MAC by using a secret key shared with the intended recipient; and
- sending the message and MAC to the intended recipient.

Thus, Menezes discusses the use of an authentication code for a message and not for a computer software programs. Therefore, Menezes does not teach, suggest or disclose "a step for constructing a single identifier for a group of several computer software programs to be transmitted during step c) based on information relating to each of the software programs of the group and in that the at least one encryption/decryption module carries out the same operation as that carried out during step e)," as in claim 1.

Further, even if the MAC could be used as an identifier of a computer software programs, Menezes does not describe the use of a single identifier for a group of several computer software programs to be transmitted, nor that this identifier is calculated constructed from information relating to each of the software programs of the group.

Thus, Menezes does not disclose the advantageous benefit of allowing a single identifier to be used for multiple computer programs as in the present claims.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Maillard and Menezes, taken separately or in combination, fail to render obvious the features of claims 1 and 12 and the claims dependent therefrom.

Claims 5 and 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Maillard in view of Menezes in view of Booth, WO 01/61437. The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an argument.

Booth adds nothing to the deficiencies of Maillard and Menezes as applied against the independent claims. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, Maillard, Menezes and Booth taken separately or in combination, fail to render obvious the features of claims 5 and 9.

Claims 14 and 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Maillard in view of Menezes in view of Booth in further view of Gammie, U.S. Patent No. 5,029,207. The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an argument.

Gammie adds nothing to the deficiencies of Maillard, Menezes and Booth as applied against the independent claims. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, Maillard, Menezes, Booth and Gammie taken separately or in combination,

fail to render obvious the features of claims 14 and 18.

Claims 6-8 and 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Maillard in view of Menezes in further view of Nagae, U.S. Patent No. 5,598,530. The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an argument.

Nagae adds nothing to the deficiencies of Maillard and Menezes as applied against the independent claims. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, Maillard, Menezes and Nagae taken separately or in combination, fail to render obvious the features of claims 6-8 and 20.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

#### SUMMARY

It is submitted that the claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 103. It is also submitted that claims 1-3 and 5-20 continue to be allowable. It is further submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

/James J. Livingston/  
James J. Livingston, Jr.  
Reg.No. 55,394  
209 Madison St, Suite 500  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
Telephone (703) 521-2297  
Telefax (703) 685-0573  
(703) 979-4709

JJL/jr